

Epistemic extensions of combined classical and intuitionistic propositional logic

Steffen Lewitzka *

November 7, 2016

Abstract

Logic L was introduced by Lewitzka [8] as a modal system that combines intuitionistic and classical logic: L is a conservative extension of CPC and it contains a copy of IPC via embedding $\varphi \mapsto \Box\varphi$. In this article, we consider $L3$, i.e. L augmented with S3 modal axioms, define basic epistemic extensions and prove completeness w.r.t. algebraic semantics. Our systems involve, in adapted form, some of the epistemic principles of *Intuitionistic Epistemic Logic* presented by Artemov and Protopopescu [1]. In particular, the implications “*intuitionistic truth* $\Rightarrow$ *knowledge* $\Rightarrow$ *classical truth*” are given as theorems $\Box\varphi \rightarrow K\varphi$ and $K\varphi \rightarrow \varphi$ of our logic $EL3$. Intuitionistic and classical (epistemic) principles are combined within a single system. Finally, we show that a slight modification of our semantics yields algebraic models for the systems of Intuitionistic Epistemic Logic studied in [1].

1 Introduction

We are inspired by recent research on non-Fregean logics [6, 8, 7, 5], an approach originally proposed by R. Suszko (see, e.g., [10, 2]). A non-Fregean logic contains an identity connective and formulas of the form $\varphi \equiv \psi$ expressing that φ and ψ have the same meaning, denotation. The basic classical non-Fregean logic is the Sentential Calculus with Identity SCI [2] which can be axiomatized by classical propositional logic CPC along with the following identity axioms:

*Instituto de Matemática, Departamento de Ciência da Computação, Universidade Federal da Bahia UFBA, 40170-110 Salvador – BA, Brazil, e-mail: steffen@dcc.ufba.br

- (Id1) $\varphi \equiv \varphi$
 (Id2) $(\varphi \equiv \psi) \rightarrow (\varphi \leftrightarrow \psi)$
 (Id3) $(\varphi \equiv \psi) \rightarrow (\chi[x := \varphi] \equiv \chi[x := \psi])$

where $\varphi[x := \psi]$ is the formula that results from substituting ψ for every occurrence of variable x in φ . We refer to (Id1)–(Id3) as the *axioms of propositional identity*.¹ According to G. Frege, the meaning of a formula is given by its truth value. This can be formalized by a scheme called by Suszko the *Fregean Axiom*: $(\varphi \leftrightarrow \psi) \rightarrow (\varphi \equiv \psi)$, i.e. two formulas denote the same proposition whenever they have the same truth value. In non-Fregean logics, the Fregean Axiom is not valid.

Recall that C.I. Lewis' modal systems S1–S3 were originally designed as axiomatizations of laws for strict implication $\Box(\varphi \rightarrow \psi)$ (see, e.g., [4] for a discussion). One immediately recognizes that all Lewis systems S1–S5 satisfy the axioms (Id1) and (Id2) of propositional identity if $\varphi \equiv \psi$ is defined as strict equivalence $\Box(\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \wedge \Box(\psi \rightarrow \varphi)$.² In [6, 7] we proved that S3 is the weakest Lewis modal logic where strict equivalence satisfies all axioms of propositional identity (Id1)–(Id3). Moreover, in [6] we showed that logic S1+SP, i.e. S1 augmented with (Id3) as theorem scheme, which we also call the Substitution Principle SP, has a simple algebraic semantics.³ With system S1+SP we proposed a formalization of strict equivalence as propositional identity in the sense of Suszko's intuitive axioms (Id1)–(Id3) above. We were able to show that S1+SP is distinct from S2 and is strictly contained in S3.

S1+SP can be regarded as the weakest modal system that combines Lewis' approach to strict implication with the principles of Suszko's non-Fregean logic SCI. Proceeding from these assumptions, we proposed in [8] the modal logic L , which is axiomatized by intuitionistic logic IPC, the modal axioms of S1 together with a modal axiom expressing the constructive character of intuitionistic truth, and SP and *tertium non datur* as theorems. L is a *classical* logic in which the modal operator $\Box$, applied to propositional formulas, plays the role of an intuitionistic truth predicate. Consequently, intuitionistically equivalent formulas denote the same proposition (e.g. $\neg\varphi \equiv \neg\neg\neg\varphi$ is a theorem), although classically equivalent formulas have in general different meanings ($\varphi \equiv \neg\neg\varphi$ is not a theorem,

¹Instead of (Id3), Suszko presents a set of three axioms which together are equivalent to (Id3). By a *proposition* we mean the denotation of a formula in a given modeltheoretical semantics. Instead of *proposition*, Suszko applies the term *situation*.

²Certain connections between non-Fregean logic and the modal systems S4 and S5 were already investigated by Suszko and Bloom (see [2, 9]).

³Recall that there is no known intuitive semantics for S1.

but $\varphi \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\varphi$ is a theorem). L is a conservative modal extension of CPC and contains a copy of IPC via the embedding $\varphi \mapsto \Box\varphi$. In this sense, L combines CPC and IPC. In the present paper, we consider $L3$ – the $S3$ -version of L , and investigate basic epistemic extensions. In this setting of combined classical and intuitionistic logic, the question arises in which way epistemic laws of knowledge and belief relate to the modal laws of $L3$. We are inspired by the approach developed in [5] where a non-Fregean semantics for the modeling of epistemic properties is presented. Knowledge or belief of an agent is modeled in a natural way as a set of propositions, i.e. as a subset $BEL \subseteq M$ of the universe M of an algebraic (non-Fregean) model. In the cases of our logics L and $L3$, a non-Fregean model is a Heyting algebra where classical truth is represented by an ultrafilter $TRUE$, and intuitionistic truth is given by the top element of the underlying lattice. Recall that all intuitionistic tautologies denote the top element of any given Heyting algebra (under all assignments). We assume that also our modal axioms are intuitionistically acceptable and therefore should denote the top element, too. Furthermore, we also assume that at least all axioms should be known by the agent. Hence, the top element is a known proposition, i.e. an element of BEL . This is axiomatized by the scheme $\Box\varphi \rightarrow K\varphi$. The semantical condition $BEL \subseteq TRUE$ corresponds to the facticity of knowledge, i.e. to the axiom $K\varphi \rightarrow \varphi$. Many further properties of knowledge and belief, such as the distribution law $K(\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \rightarrow (K\varphi \rightarrow K\psi)$, can be modeled semantically by imposing suitable closure conditions on the set BEL of each model.⁴

Special attention deserves the bridge axiom $\Box\varphi \rightarrow K\varphi$ which establishes the connection between the modal and the epistemic part of the logic. Reading $\Box$ as an intuitionistic truth predicate, the bridge axiom can be seen as an adaption of *intuitionistic co-reflection* $\varphi \rightarrow K\varphi$ coming from the systems IEL^- and IEL of Intuitionistic Epistemic Logic introduced by Artemov and Protopopescu [1]. IEL^- and IEL are intuitionistic logics where truth is understood as proof, and intuitionistic co-reflection reads as “proof yields (verification based) knowledge and belief” [1]. The classical principle of the facticity of knowledge, $K\varphi \rightarrow \varphi$, called *reflection* in [1], appears in logic IEL as *intuitionistic reflection* $K\varphi \rightarrow \neg\neg\varphi$, i.e. “known propositions cannot be false”. We adopt this principle as an (intuitionistically acceptable) axiom. Reflection $K\varphi \rightarrow \varphi$ then derives as a theorem of our classical logics. In particular, the meta-language implications “intuitionistic truth yields (intuitionistic) knowledge yields classical truth”, underlying the whole approach of [1], can be restored in our epistemic logics in form of the theorems

⁴In [5] are modeled also more complex epistemic concepts such as common knowledge.

$\Box\varphi \rightarrow K\varphi$ (an adapted form of co-reflection) and $K\varphi \rightarrow \varphi$ (classical reflection).

In fact, we are able to restore further properties of intuitionistic knowledge discussed in [1]. For this purpose, we augment $L3$ with the modal axioms $\Box\varphi \rightarrow \Box\Box\varphi$ and $\neg\Box\varphi \rightarrow \Box\neg\Box\varphi$ which results in the sufficiently strong logics $L4$ and $L5$. On the other hand, very strong epistemic properties are avoided. For instance, Intuitionistic Epistemic Logic necessarily involves positive and negative introspection: $K\varphi \rightarrow KK\varphi$ as well as $\neg K\varphi \rightarrow K\neg K\varphi$ are theorems. In a classical setting, those laws are often regarded as too strong for a realistic modeling of knowledge and the reasoning power of agents.

2 Deductive systems

The language is inductively defined in the usual way over an infinite set of variables $x_0, x_1, \dots$, logical connectives $\wedge, \vee, \rightarrow, \perp$, the modal operator $\Box$ and the epistemic operator K . Fm denotes the set of all formulas and $Fm_0 \subseteq Fm$ is the set of *propositional formulas*, i.e. formulas that neither contain the modal operator $\Box$ nor the epistemic operator K . We shall use the following abbreviations:

$$\begin{aligned} \neg\varphi &:= \varphi \rightarrow \perp \\ \top &:= \neg\perp \\ \varphi \leftrightarrow \psi &:= (\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \wedge (\psi \rightarrow \varphi) \\ \varphi \equiv \psi &:= \Box(\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \wedge \Box(\psi \rightarrow \varphi) \text{ ("propositional identity = strict equivalence")} \\ \Box\Phi &:= \{\Box\psi \mid \psi \in \Phi\}, \text{ for } \Phi \subseteq Fm \end{aligned}$$

We consider the following **Axiom Schemes** (INT) and (A1)–(A8)

(INT) all theorems of IPC and their substitution-instances⁵

(A1) $\Box(\varphi \vee \psi) \rightarrow (\Box\varphi \vee \Box\psi)$

(A2) $\Box\varphi \rightarrow \varphi$

(A3) $\Box(\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \rightarrow \Box(\Box\varphi \rightarrow \Box\psi)$

(A4) $\Box\varphi \rightarrow \Box\Box\varphi$

(A5) $\neg\Box\varphi \rightarrow \Box\neg\Box\varphi$

(A6) $K(\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \rightarrow (K\varphi \rightarrow K\psi)$ (distribution of belief)

(A7) $\Box\varphi \rightarrow K\varphi$ (co-reflection)

⁵A substitution-instance of φ is the result of replacing some occurrences of a variable x in φ by some formula $\psi \in Fm$.

(A8) $K\varphi \rightarrow \neg\neg\varphi$ (intuitionistic reflection)

and the following **Theorem Scheme** (T) of *tertium non datur*

(T) $\varphi \vee \neg\varphi$

The inference rules are Modus Ponens MP “From φ and $\varphi \rightarrow \psi$ infer ψ ”, and Axiom Necessitation AN “If φ is an axiom, then infer $\Box\varphi$ ”.

The distinction between *axioms* and *theorems* in the definition of our deductive systems is important: axioms are regarded as intuitionistically acceptable formulas and rule AN applies only to axioms.

The systems IEL^- and IEL of Intuitionistic Epistemic Logic studied in [1] are axiomatized by (INT), (A6), intuitionistic co-reflection $\varphi \rightarrow K\varphi$ instead of (A7), and, only in case of IEL , additionally (A8). The only inference rule is MP. If we would add to the axioms (INT) and (A1)–(A8) the axiom scheme $\varphi \rightarrow \Box\varphi$, then, by (A2), we would obtain a system which is essentially equivalent to IEL .

If instead of (INT) we consider (CL), i.e. all theorems of CPC and their substitution-instances, (A2) and the following (A3’)

$$\Box(\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \rightarrow (\Box(\psi \rightarrow \chi) \rightarrow \Box(\varphi \rightarrow \chi)),$$

as axiom schemes, along with the rules of MP and the Substitution of Proved Strict Equivalents SPSE “If $(\varphi \equiv \psi)$ is a theorem, then $(\chi[x := \varphi] \equiv \chi[x := \psi])$ is a theorem”, then we obtain Lewis’ modal system S1 (see, e.g., [4] for a similar presentation). Stronger than rule SPSE is the following axiom scheme (Id3) of propositional identity, which we also call the Substitution Property SP:

$$(\varphi \equiv \psi) \rightarrow (\chi[x := \varphi] \equiv \chi[x := \psi]).$$

The system S1+SP, introduced and studied in [6], results from S1 by adding all formulas of the form SP as theorems. Recall that (A3) is the essential axiom scheme of S3, i.e. S3 results from S2 (or even from S1) by adding (A3) as an axiom. By $\Box$ SP we refer to the collection of all instances of scheme SP prefixed by operator $\Box$. System S1+ $\Box$ SP then results from S1 by adding all instances of $\Box$ SP as theorems. We saw in [6] that $S1+SP \subsetneq S1+\Box SP \subseteq S3$. In particular, all instances of $\Box$ SP are derivable in S3 (but not in S2). The question whether S1+ $\Box$ SP

equals S3, however, is left open. Modal system L , introduced in [8], results from S1+SP by replacing (CL) with (INT), adding (A1) as an axiom scheme and adding (T) as a theorem scheme. L is the weakest modal logic that contains the basic laws of Lewis' strict implication and Suszko's non-Fregean logic, and combines IPC and CPC in the sense of [8]. L contains the instances of SP as theorems instead of axioms. However, since $\Box$ is intended as a predicate for intuitionistic truth, it seems to be reasonable to extend logic L in the sense that rule AN applies to *all* intuitionistically acceptable formulas, including the instances of SP. We know that $\Box\text{SP}$ is contained in S3. Moreover, it is technically easier to work with S3-axioms instead of scheme $\Box\text{SP}$. For these reasons, we consider in this paper the logic $L3$ which results from L by adding the S3-axiom (A3). That is, $L3$ is given by the axiom schemes (INT) and (A1)–(A3), the theorem scheme (T) and the inference rules of MP and AN. We define the following epistemic extensions of $L3$:

- $EL3^- = L3 + (A7)$
- $EL3 = EL3^- + (A8)$
- $EL4 = EL3 + (A4)$
- $EL5 = EL4 + (A5)$

The notion of derivation is defined as usual. For $\Phi \cup \{\varphi\} \subseteq Fm$, we write $\Phi \vdash_{\mathcal{L}} \varphi$ if there is a derivation of φ from Φ in logic $\mathcal{L}$.

The next two facts are useful. The first one is an adaption of a result coming from [[6]], Lemma 2.2], and the second one follows readily from the axioms (A3) and (A2).

Lemma 2.1. *The following formulas are theorems:*

- $\Box\varphi \leftrightarrow (\varphi \equiv \top)$
- $\Box(\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \rightarrow (\Box\varphi \rightarrow \Box\psi)$ (*distribution*)

Axiom (A8) of intuitionistic reflection, as established and discussed in [1], yields (classical) reflection $K\varphi \rightarrow \varphi$ if the underlying logic is classical:

Theorem 2.2. *$EL3$ has classical reflection: $\vdash_{EL3} K\varphi \rightarrow \varphi$.*

Theorem 2.3. $\vdash_{EL4} \Box\varphi \rightarrow \Box K\varphi$.

Proof. Apply AN to axiom $\Box\varphi \rightarrow K\varphi$. By distribution and MP, $\Box\Box\varphi \rightarrow \Box K\varphi$. Axiom (A4) and transitivity of implication yield $\Box\varphi \rightarrow \Box K\varphi$. $\square$

$\Box\varphi \rightarrow \Box K\varphi$ can be read as “the existence of a proof for φ implies the existence of a proof for $K\varphi$ ”, a classical counterpart of intuitionistic co-reflection $\varphi \rightarrow K\varphi$ valid in Intuitionistic Epistemic Logic [1]. As we shall see in Theorem 4.4 below, $\Box K\varphi \rightarrow \Box\varphi$ is not derivable. In fact, it is argued in [1] that the intuitionistic interpretation of reflection $K\varphi \rightarrow \varphi$, “given a proof of $K\varphi$, one can construct a proof of φ ”, should be rejected. Instead, we adopt intuitionistic reflection $K\varphi \rightarrow \neg\neg\varphi$ as a principle which is “acceptable both classically and intuitionistically” [1].

Theorem 7 of [1] states that $\neg K\varphi \leftrightarrow K\neg\varphi$. The right-to-left implication should be valid in any classical logic of knowledge. However, the left-to-right implication would be a very strong epistemic property in any classical setting. We show that a corresponding weaker implication is valid in $EL5$.

Theorem 2.4. $\vdash_{EL5} \neg K\varphi \rightarrow K\neg\Box\varphi$.

Proof. By co-reflection, $\neg K\varphi \rightarrow \neg\Box\varphi$. $\neg\Box\varphi \rightarrow \Box\neg\Box\varphi$ is an instance of (A5), and $\Box\neg\Box\varphi \rightarrow K\neg\Box\varphi$ is an instance of co-reflection. By transitivity of implication, $\neg K\varphi \rightarrow K\neg\Box\varphi$. $\square$

In Intuitionistic Epistemic Logic IEL, the principle $\neg K\varphi \leftrightarrow \neg\varphi$ is valid [[1], Theorem 8]. We are able to present the following corresponding result:

Theorem 2.5. $\vdash_{EL4} K\Box\varphi \leftrightarrow \Box\varphi$.

Proof. $\Box\varphi \rightarrow \Box\Box\varphi$ and $\Box\Box\varphi \rightarrow K\Box\varphi$ are axioms of $EL4$ and yield the right-to-left implication. The left-to-right implication is an instance of reflection. $\square$

In Intuitionistic Epistemic Logic IEL, “no truth is unverifiable”, i.e. $\neg(\neg K\varphi \wedge \neg K\neg\varphi)$ is a theorem [[1], Theorem 9]. In a classical setting, this would mean that for any formula φ , either φ is known or $\neg\varphi$ is known – a very strong assumption which would imply that knowledge is equivalent with truth. An acceptable translation of “no intuitionistic truth is unverifiable” into the classical setting might be given by the following scheme which holds in $EL5$.

Theorem 2.6. $\vdash_{EL5} K\Box\varphi \vee K\neg\Box\varphi$.

Proof. By *tertium non datur*, $\Box\varphi \vee \neg\Box\varphi$. By the axioms (A4) and (A5), that yields $\Box\Box\varphi \vee \Box\neg\Box\varphi$. Now apply co-reflection. $\square$

The previous results suggest that logic $EL5$ is strong enough to reflect most of the important intuitionistic epistemic principles discussed in [1]. Strong properties of IEL^- , such as positive and negative introspection, are avoided in our classical setting.

3 Algebraic semantics

We expect the reader to be familiar with some basic lattice-theoretical notions such as (prime, ultra-) filters on lattices. We adopt the notation from [6, 8] and write a bounded lattice as an algebraic structure $\mathcal{H} = (H, f_\perp, f_\top, f_\vee, f_\wedge)$, where $f_\perp, f_\top$ are the least and the greatest elements w.r.t. the induced lattice order, and $f_\vee, f_\wedge$ are the binary operations for join and meet, respectively. Recall that a Heyting algebra can be defined as a bounded lattice together with an additional binary operation for implication $f_\rightarrow$ which maps any two elements m, m' to the supremum of $\{m'' \mid f_\wedge(m, m'') \leq m'\}$, where $\leq$ is the lattice order. That supremum $f_\rightarrow(m, m')$ is also called the relative pseudo-complement of m with respect to m' . The pseudo-complement $f_-(m)$ of an element m then is defined by $f_-(m) = f_\rightarrow(m, f_\perp)$. As in [8], we say that a Heyting algebra has the *Disjunction Property* DP if its smallest filter $\{f_\perp\}$ is a prime filter. Note that in a Heyting algebra with DP, the equation $f_\vee(m, m') = f_\top$ is equivalent to the condition that $m = f_\top$ or $m' = f_\top$. A Boolean algebra $\mathcal{B}$ has DP if and only if $\mathcal{B}$ has at most two elements.

Our algebraic models are given by certain Heyting algebras with a designated ultrafilter as truth-set. An ultrafilter is defined as a maximal filter (which exists by Zorn's Lemma). Maximal filters reflect the *classical* behavior of the logical connectives in the sense of item (b) of the next Lemma. On the other hand, intuitionistic truth can be represented by the greatest element of a Heyting algebra. In this way, we are able to model and to combine classical and intuitionistic truth within the same Heyting algebra. The following facts are crucial for our semantic modeling.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a Heyting algebra with universe H .*

- (a) *$U \subseteq H$ is an ultrafilter iff there is an Heyting algebra homomorphism h from $\mathcal{H}$ to the two-element Boolean algebra $\mathcal{B}$ such that the top element of $\mathcal{B}$ is precisely the image of U under h .*
- (b) *If $U \subseteq H$ is an ultrafilter, then for all $m, m' \in H$:*

- $f_{\vee}(m, m') \in U$ iff $m \in U$ or $m' \in U$ (i.e. U is a prime filter)
- $m \in U$ or $f_{\neg}(m) \in U$
- $f_{\rightarrow}(m, m') \in U$ iff $[m \notin U \text{ or } m' \in U]$ iff $f_{\vee}(f_{\neg}(m), m') \in U$.

Proof. (a) is a well-known property of Heyting algebras, (b) follows straightforwardly from (a). $\square$

Definition 3.2. A $EL3^-$ -model is a Heyting algebra

$$\mathcal{M} = (M, TRUE, BEL, f_{\perp}, f_{\top}, f_{\vee}, f_{\wedge}, f_{\rightarrow}, f_{\square}, f_K)$$

with a designated ultrafilter $TRUE \subseteq M$, a set $BEL \subseteq M$ and additional unary operations $f_{\square}$ and f_K such that for all $m, m', m'' \in M$ the following truth conditions are fulfilled (as before, $\leq$ denotes the lattice order):

- (i) $f_{\square}(f_{\vee}(m, m')) \leq f_{\vee}(f_{\square}(m), f_{\square}(m'))$
- (ii) $f_{\square}(m) \leq m$
- (iii) $f_{\square}(f_{\rightarrow}(m, m')) \leq f_{\square}(f_{\rightarrow}(f_{\square}(m), f_{\square}(m')))$
- (iv) $f_{\square}(m) \in TRUE \Leftrightarrow m = f_{\top}$
- (v) $f_K(m) \in TRUE \Leftrightarrow m \in BEL$
- (vi) $f_K(f_{\rightarrow}(m, m')) \leq f_{\rightarrow}(f_K(m), f_K(m'))$
- (vii) $f_{\square}(m) \leq f_K(m)$

A $EL3$ -model is a $EL3^-$ that satisfies the additionally truth condition (viii): $f_K(m) \leq f_{\neg}(f_{\neg}(m))$, for all propositions m .

We regard M as a propositional universe and $TRUE \subseteq M$ as the set of propositions which are classically true. The propositions $f_{\top}$, $f_{\perp}$ represent intuitionistic truth and intuitionistic falsity, respectively. BEL is the set of believed propositions. If $BEL \subseteq TRUE$, then we identify belief with knowledge.

Recall that in any Heyting algebra: $m \leq m' \Leftrightarrow f_{\rightarrow}(m, m') = f_{\top}$. Now observe that the truth conditions (i)–(iii) and (vi)–(viii) of the above definition correspond to applications of rule AN to the axioms (A1)–(A3) and (A6)–(A8), respectively. Truth condition (iv) establishes the relation between intuitionistic and classical truth via the necessity operator. Similarly, truth condition (v) defines

the relation between belief and classical truth.

Note that truth condition (viii) of a *EL3*-model, together with truth condition (v) and Lemma 3.1, implies that $BEL \subseteq TRUE$. That is, believed propositions are classically true and belief is knowledge in any *EL3*-model. On the other hand, in any model, the condition $BEL \subseteq TRUE$ is equivalent to the condition $f_{\rightarrow}(f_K(m), m) \in TRUE$, for all propositions m . From the definition of modeltheoretic satisfaction below it will follow that models with the property $BEL \subseteq TRUE$ are precisely the models satisfying classical reflection $K\varphi \rightarrow \varphi$.

The truth conditions (i) and (iv) ensure that every model has the Disjunction Property DP: for all $m, m' \in M$, $f_{\vee}(m, m') = f_{\top}$ iff $m = f_{\top}$ or $m' = f_{\top}$.

Definition 3.3. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a *EL3*-model. We say that

- $\mathcal{M}$ is a *EL4*-model if for all $m \in M$: $f_{\Box}(m) \leq f_{\Box}(f_{\Box}(m))$ ⁶
- $\mathcal{M}$ is a *EL5*-model if for all $m \in M$ the following holds:

$$f_{\Box}(m) = \begin{cases} f_{\top}, & \text{if } m = f_{\top} \\ f_{\perp}, & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

Note that the defining condition of *EL5*-models implies $f_{\Box}(m) \leq f_{\Box}(f_{\Box}(m))$ and $f_{\Box}(f_{\Box}(m)) \leq f_{\Box}(f_{\Box}(f_{\Box}(m)))$, for all propositions m . In particular, every *EL5*-model is a *EL4*-model.

Definition 3.4. Let $\mathcal{L} \in \{EL3^-, EL3, EL4, EL5\}$. An assignment of a $\mathcal{L}$ -model $\mathcal{M}$ is a function $\gamma: V \rightarrow M$ that extends in the canonical way to a homomorphism from Fm to the universe M of $\mathcal{M}$: $\gamma(\perp) = f_{\perp}$, $\gamma(\top) = f_{\top}$, $\gamma(\Box\varphi) = f_{\Box}(\gamma(\varphi))$, $\gamma(K\varphi) = f_K(\gamma(\varphi))$, $\gamma(\varphi * \psi) = f_*(\gamma(\varphi), \gamma(\psi))$, for $*$ $\in \{\vee, \wedge, \rightarrow\}$. A $\mathcal{L}$ -interpretation is a tuple $(\mathcal{M}, \gamma)$ consisting of a $\mathcal{L}$ -model and an assignment. The relation of satisfaction is defined by

$$(\mathcal{M}, \gamma) \models \varphi :\Leftrightarrow \gamma(\varphi) \in TRUE$$

and extends in the usual way to sets of formulas. The relation of logical consequence is defined by $\Phi \Vdash_{\mathcal{L}} \varphi :\Leftrightarrow (\mathcal{M}, \gamma) \models \Phi$ implies $(\mathcal{M}, \gamma) \models \varphi$, for every $\mathcal{L}$ -interpretation $(\mathcal{M}, \gamma)$.

⁶Note that this, together with (iv), implies the weaker condition $f_{\Box}(m) = f_{\top} \Leftrightarrow m = f_{\top}$.

The following is not hard to prove (see, e.g., [6]):

$$(\mathcal{M}, \gamma) \models \varphi \equiv \psi \Leftrightarrow \gamma(\varphi) = \gamma(\psi).$$

That is, $\varphi \equiv \psi$ is true iff φ and ψ denote the same proposition – this is precisely the intended meaning of an identity connective. By Lemma 3.1, the condition that $f_{\rightarrow}(m, m')$ belongs to the ultrafilter $TRUE$ of a given model is equivalent to the condition: $m \in TRUE \Leftrightarrow m' \in TRUE$. The latter, however, does not imply $m = m'$. Thus, the Fregean Axiom $(\varphi \leftrightarrow \psi) \rightarrow (\varphi \equiv \psi)$ is not valid. This shows that we are actually dealing with a non-Fregean semantics.

4 Soundness, completeness and some consequences

It is a well-known fact that all intuitionistic theorems evaluate to the top element in every Heyting algebra under any assignment. Also recall that $f_{\rightarrow}(m, m') = f_{\top} \Leftrightarrow m \leq m'$ is a general law in Heyting algebras. Then the soundness of axioms (INT) and (A1)–(A3) as well as the soundness of rule AN follows from properties of Heyting algebras along with the truth conditions (i)–(iii) of a model. Theorem scheme (T) of *tertium non datur* is sound because $TRUE$ is an ultrafilter, see Lemma 3.1 (b). Properties of ultrafilters also ensure soundness of rule MP. Furthermore, one easily checks that the additional truth conditions of a $EL3$ -, $EL4$ -, $EL5$ -model ensure soundness of the axioms (A8), (A4), (A5), respectively – inclusively soundness of the application of AN to those axioms. We conclude that the logics $EL3^-$, $EL3$, $EL4$, $EL5$ are sound with respect to the corresponding classes of models: $\Phi \vdash_{\mathcal{L}} \varphi$ implies $\Phi \Vdash_{\mathcal{L}} \varphi$, for $\mathcal{L} \in \{EL3^-, EL3, EL4, EL5\}$.

In the following, we consider $EL5$ as the underlying deductive system. The notions of (in)consistent and maximal consistent set of formulas are defined as usual. By standard arguments, any consistent set extends to a maximal consistent set of formulas. We show that every maximal consistent set Φ is satisfiable, i.e. there is a $EL5$ -model $\mathcal{M}$ and an assignment $\gamma: V \rightarrow M$ such that $(\mathcal{M}, \gamma) \models \Phi$. For a maximal consistent set Φ , we define the relation $\approx_{\Phi}$ on Fm by $\varphi \approx_{\Phi} \psi : \Leftrightarrow \Phi \vdash_{EL5} \varphi \equiv \psi$. The next Lemma then can be shown in the same way as the corresponding Lemma 4.1 of [8].

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\Phi \subseteq Fm$ be consistent. The relation $\approx_{\Phi}$ is an equivalence relation on Fm with the following properties:*

- If $\varphi_1 \approx_\Phi \psi_1$ and $\varphi_2 \approx_\Phi \psi_2$, then $\neg\varphi_1 \approx_\Phi \neg\psi_1$, $\Box\varphi_1 \approx_\Phi \Box\psi_1$, $K\varphi_1 \approx_\Phi K\psi_1$ and $(\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2) \approx_\Phi (\psi_1 \rightarrow \psi_2)$.
- If $\varphi \approx_\Phi \psi$, then $\varphi \in \Phi \Leftrightarrow \psi \in \Phi$.
- If $\varphi \approx_\Phi \psi$, then $\Box\varphi \in \Phi \Leftrightarrow \Box\psi \in \Phi$.

Lemma 4.2. *If $\Psi \subseteq Fm$ is consistent, then there is a $EL5$ -interpretation $(\mathcal{M}, \gamma)$ such that $(\mathcal{M}, \gamma) \models \Psi$.*

Proof. Let Ψ be consistent. By Zorn's Lemma, Ψ is contained in a maximal consistent set Φ . For $\varphi \in Fm$, let $\overline{\varphi}$ be the equivalence class of φ modulo $\approx_\Phi$. We define:

- $M = \{\overline{\varphi} \mid \varphi \in Fm\}$
- $TRUE = \{\overline{\varphi} \mid \varphi \in \Phi\}$
- $BEL = \{\overline{\varphi} \mid K\varphi \in \Phi\}$
- functions $f_\top, f_\perp, f_\Box, f_*$, where $*$ $\in \{\vee, \wedge, \rightarrow\}$, by $f_\top = \overline{\top}$, $f_\perp = \overline{\perp}$, $f_\Box(\overline{\varphi}) = \overline{\Box\varphi}$, $f_K(\overline{\varphi}) = \overline{K\varphi}$, $f_*(\overline{\varphi}, \overline{\psi}) = \overline{\varphi * \psi}$, respectively.

In the same way as in the proof of the corresponding Lemma 4.2 of [8], one shows that $\mathcal{M}$ is a Heyting algebra with ultrafilter $TRUE$ such that the truth conditions of a model hold: $\mathcal{M}$ is a Heyting algebra because all intuitionistic theorems are contained in Φ , in particular those of the form $\varphi \leftrightarrow \psi$. Rule AN then yields $\Phi \vdash_{EL5} \varphi \equiv \psi$. Thus, $\mathcal{M}$ satisfies the equations which axiomatize the class of Heyting algebras. By Lemma 3.1, $TRUE$ is an ultrafilter. Truth condition (iv) of Definition 3.2 is warranted by Lemma 2.1. Truth condition (v) holds by definition of the set BEL . The remaining truth conditions of a $EL5$ -model follow from the corresponding axioms, all contained in Φ , along with applications of rule AN. Defining the assignment $\gamma: V \rightarrow M$ by $x \mapsto \overline{x}$, one shows by induction on the complexity of formulas that $\gamma(\varphi) = \overline{\varphi}$ for any formula φ . Finally: $\varphi \in \Phi \Leftrightarrow \overline{\varphi} \in TRUE \Leftrightarrow \gamma(\varphi) \in TRUE \Leftrightarrow (\mathcal{M}, \gamma) \models \varphi$. $\square$

By CPC, $\Phi \not\vdash_{EL5} \varphi$ implies that $\Phi \cup \{\neg\varphi\}$ is consistent in $EL5$. This yields the Completeness Theorem.

Corollary 4.3. *Let $\mathcal{L} \in \{EL3^-, EL3, EL4, EL5\}$ and $\Phi \cup \{\varphi\} \subseteq Fm$. Then $\Phi \Vdash_{\mathcal{L}} \varphi$ if and only if $\Phi \vdash_{\mathcal{L}} \varphi$.*

In [1], the principle of intuitionistic reflection “Given a proof of $K\varphi$, one can construct a proof of φ ” is rejected. In fact, it is shown [[1], Theorem 5] that $K\varphi \rightarrow \varphi$ is not derivable in Intuitionistic Epistemic Logic. In the following, we prove a corresponding result.

Theorem 4.4. $\not\models_{EL5} \Box K\varphi \rightarrow \Box \varphi$.

Proof. It is enough to construct a $EL5$ -model that satisfies $\Box K\varphi$ and $\neg \Box \varphi$. Then $\not\models_{EL5} \Box K\varphi \rightarrow \Box \varphi$ and the assertion follows from soundness of logic $EL5$. We consider the closed interval $M = [0, 1]$ of real numbers from 0 to 1 and the semi-open subset $TRUE = (0, 1] = M \setminus \{0\}$. One easily checks that the natural order on M induces a Heyting algebra with disjunction property where meet and join are the operations for infimum and supremum, respectively, and implication is given by $f_{\rightarrow}(m, m') = 1$ if $m \leq m'$, and $f_{\rightarrow}(m, m') = m'$ if $m > m'$. Of course, $TRUE$ is an ultrafilter on M . Let $b \in M$ be any real with $0 < b < 1$. Then we put $BEL = [b, 1]$. We define operations $f_{\Box}$ and f_K on M as follows:

$$f_{\Box}(m) := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } m = 1 \\ 0, & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

and

$$f_K(m) := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } m \in BEL \\ 0, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Then it is not hard to verify that all truth conditions of a $EL5$ -model are fulfilled. We show this in detail only for truth condition (vi): $f_K(f_{\rightarrow}(m, m')) \leq f_{\rightarrow}(f_K(m), f_K(m'))$, for all reals $m, m' \in [0, 1]$. Of course, the condition is fulfilled if $f_K(f_{\rightarrow}(m, m')) = 0$. So we assume $f_K(f_{\rightarrow}(m, m')) = 1$, i.e. $f_{\rightarrow}(m, m') \in BEL$. Then it is enough to show that $f_K(m) \leq f_K(m')$. Again, we may assume $f_K(m) = 1$, i.e. $m \in BEL$. If $m \leq m'$, then we get $m' \in BEL$ and $f_K(m') = 1$. Otherwise, $m' < m$. This implies $m' = f_{\rightarrow}(m, m')$. Since $f_{\rightarrow}(m, m') \in BEL$, we conclude $f_K(m') = 1$. Thus, truth condition (vi) holds.

By definition of the set BEL , there exists a $m \in BEL \setminus \{1\}$. Then for $x \in V$ and for any assignment $\gamma: V \rightarrow M$ with $\gamma(x) = m$, we have $\gamma(\Box Kx) = f_{\Box}(\gamma(Kx)) = f_{\Box}(f_K(m)) = 1$, and $\gamma(\Box x) = f_{\Box}(m) = 0$. Thus, $(\mathcal{M}, \gamma) \models \Box Kx$ and $(\mathcal{M}, \gamma) \not\models \Box x$. $\square$

Theorem 4.4 can also be seen as a *model existence theorem*. In fact, it was not so clear whether there exist (non-trivial) models for our epistemic logis. Note

that the model construction presented in the completeness proof does not serve as a *model existence theorem* since it presupposes the consistency of the underlying deductive system. Consistency, in turn, follows from the existence of models

Theorem 4.5. $\not\models_{EL5} K\varphi \vee K\neg\varphi$.

Proof. The model constructed in the proof of Theorem 4.4 is a counter-example: Choose any $m \in M$ with $0 < m < b$. Then $m \notin BEL$ and $f_{\neg}(m) = f_{\rightarrow}(m, f_{\perp}) = f_{\perp} = 0 \notin BEL$. Hence, for $\gamma(x) = m$, we have $(\mathcal{M}, \gamma) \not\models Kx \vee K\neg x$. $\square$

$K(\varphi \vee \psi) \rightarrow (K\varphi \vee K\psi)$ is not valid in Intuitionistic Epistemic Logic [[1], Theorem 10] neither it holds in our epistemic logics:

Theorem 4.6. $\not\models_{EL5} K(\varphi \vee \psi) \rightarrow (K\varphi \vee K\psi)$

Proof. We consider the Lindenbaum-Tarski algebra of IPC. This is a Heyting algebra with disjunction property – in fact, the top element $f_{\top}$ is precisely the class of all intuitionistic theorems. Let $TRUE$ be any ultrafilter and let $BEL \subseteq TRUE$ be any filter which is not prime. Of course, such filters exist: consider, e.g., the intersection of two distinct ultrafilters. We define the operations $f_{\square}$ and f_K as in the proof of Theorem 4.4. Then all truth conditions of an $EL5$ model are fulfilled. Again, we show this in detail only for truth condition (vi): $f_K(f_{\rightarrow}(m, m')) \leq f_{\rightarrow}(f_K(m), f_K(m'))$, for all propositions m . We may assume that $f_K(f_{\rightarrow}(m, m')) = f_{\top}$, i.e. $f_{\rightarrow}(m, m') \in BEL$. It suffices to show that $f_K(m) \leq f_K(m')$. We may assume $f_K(m) = f_{\top}$, i.e. $m \in BEL$. By definition of the relative pseudo-complement in a Heyting algebra, we have $f_{\wedge}(m, f_{\rightarrow}(m, m')) \leq m'$. But BEL is a filter containing m and $f_{\rightarrow}(m, m')$. It follows that $m' \in BEL$, i.e. $f_K(m') = f_{\top}$. $\square$

The next result is an adaption of [[8], Theorem 5.1] to our epistemic logics.

Theorem 4.7. Let $\mathcal{L} \in \{L3, EL3^-, EL3, EL4, EL5\}$ and $\Phi \cup \{\chi\} \subseteq Fm_0$ a set of propositional formulas. Then

$$\Box\Phi \vdash_{\mathcal{L}} \Box\chi \Leftrightarrow \Phi \vdash_{IPC} \chi.$$

Proof. The proof works exactly in the same way as the corresponding proof in [[8], Theorem 5.1]: the right-to-left implication can be shown by induction on the length of derivations, and the left-to-right-implication follows from the existence of a $EL5$ -model that satisfies $\Box\Phi$ but not $\Box\chi$. The constructed model is the same as in the original proof, but with two additional ingredients: BEL is defined as the set $\{f_{\top}\}$, and the new operator f_K is defined by $f_K(m) := f_{\square}(m)$, for all propositions m . Then all truth conditions of a $EL5$ -model are fulfilled. $\square$

Note that the assertion of Theorem 4.7 involves only propositional formulas, i.e. formulas without modal and epistemic operators. The Theorem says in particular that the mapping $\varphi \mapsto \Box\varphi$ is an embedding of IPC into our epistemic logics $EL3^-, EL3, EL4, EL5$.

Recall that a prime theory is a theory Φ such that for all formulas φ, ψ , the implication $\varphi \vee \psi \in \Phi \Rightarrow [\varphi \in \Phi \text{ or } \psi \in \Phi]$ holds.⁷ Also recall that in classical logics, the prime theories are precisely the maximal (complete) theories, while prime theories in IPC are, in general, not maximal. Of course, any maximal theory is prime, and a maximal theory in IPC is also maximal in CPC.

The semantical concept of truth is usually defined via model-theoretical satisfaction. In classical and in intuitionistic logic, the set of all true formulas (relative to a given classical model, relative to a given world of an underlying Kripke model, respectively) forms a prime theory. Thus, a formula φ is true iff φ belongs to a given prime theory. In the same way as in [[8], Proposition 5.3, Corollary 5.4, Corollary 5.5] we obtain some interesting consequences. For every interpretation I there is a prime theory Φ of IPC such that for all propositional formulas $\varphi \in Fm_0$,

$$(*) \ I \models \Box\varphi \text{ iff } \varphi \in \Phi.$$

On the other hand, for every prime theory Φ of IPC there is an interpretation I such that the above condition (*) holds true for all propositional formulas φ . In this precise sense, the necessity operator $\Box$, applied to propositional formulas, is a predicate for intuitionistic truth. In particular, since IPC has the Disjunction Property (i.e., the smallest theory of IPC is prime), one can find a unique interpretation I_{IPC} such that for all $\varphi \in Fm_0$: $I_{IPC} \models \Box\varphi$ iff $\vdash_{IPC} \varphi$.

In contrast to IPC, the intuitionistic logics IEL^- and IEL of [1] cannot be embedded into our classical epistemic logics. A reason is intuitionistic co-reflection $\varphi \rightarrow K\varphi$ which is not valid classically (but is instead represented by the classical version of co-reflection: $\Box\varphi \rightarrow K\varphi$).

The Disjunction Property of IPC is mirrored in our classical logics:

⁷By a theory of any deductive system we mean a consistent and deductively closed set of formulas.

Corollary 4.8. Suppose $\mathcal{L} \in \{L3, EL3^-, EL3, EL4, EL5\}$ and $\varphi, \psi \in Fm_0$. The following restricted disjunction property holds:

$$\vdash_{\mathcal{L}} \Box\varphi \vee \Box\psi \Rightarrow \vdash_{\mathcal{L}} \Box\varphi \text{ or } \vdash_{\mathcal{L}} \Box\psi.$$

Proof. Suppose $\vdash_{\mathcal{L}} \Box\varphi \vee \Box\psi$. Of course, $\varphi \rightarrow (\varphi \vee \psi)$ and $\psi \rightarrow (\varphi \vee \psi)$ are theorems of IPC. By AN and distribution, $\Box\varphi \rightarrow \Box(\varphi \vee \psi)$ and $\Box\psi \rightarrow \Box(\varphi \vee \psi)$. Again by IPC, we obtain $(\Box\varphi \vee \Box\psi) \rightarrow \Box(\varphi \vee \psi)$. Now we apply Theorem 4.7 and the Disjunction Property of IPC. $\square$

5 Algebraic semantics for IEL^- and IEL

The goal of this final section is to modify our algebraic semantics towards a semantics for the logics IEL^- and IEL designed in [1] where Kripke-style semantics is presented. As pointed out before, dropping the scheme of *tertium non datur* and adding the axiom scheme $\varphi \rightarrow \Box\varphi$ to $EL3^-$ and $EL3$ results in systems which are equivalent to IEL^- and IEL , respectively. The semantical counterparts of those modifications are the following. First, without *tertium non datur*, the set $TRUE$ of true propositions of a model (see Definition 3.2) is no longer required to be an ultrafilter, but only a prime filter. Second, because of the biconditional $\Box\varphi \leftrightarrow \varphi$, a formula φ denotes a true proposition if and only if $\Box\varphi$ denotes a true proposition: $\gamma(\varphi) \in TRUE$ iff $\gamma(\Box\varphi) = f_{\Box}(\gamma(\varphi)) \in TRUE$. Obviously, this can be managed by defining $f_{\Box}(m) = m$, for all propositions m of the model-theoretic universe M . Truth condition (iv) of a model then forces the equality $TRUE = \{f_{\top}\}$, i.e. $TRUE$ is the smallest prime filter of the underlying Heyting algebra and classical truth becomes intuitionistic truth. The conditions concerning the set $BEL \subseteq M$ of believed propositions remain unchanged. Consequently, we may define an algebraic model for IEL^- as follows:

Definition 5.1. A IEL^- -model is a Heyting algebra

$$\mathcal{M} = (M, BEL, f_{\perp}, f_{\top}, f_{\vee}, f_{\wedge}, f_{\rightarrow}, f_K)$$

with a set $BEL \subseteq M$ and an additional unary operation f_K such that for all propositions $m, m' \in M$ the following truth conditions hold:

- (i) $f_{\top} \in BEL$
- (ii) $f_K(m) = f_{\top} \Leftrightarrow m \in BEL$

- (iii) $m \leq f_K(m)$
- (iv) $f_K(f_{\rightarrow}(m, m')) \leq f_{\rightarrow}(f_K(m), f_K(m'))$
- (v) $f_{\vee}(m, m') = f_{\top} \Rightarrow (m = f_{\top} \text{ or } m' = f_{\top})$

If additionally $f_K(m) \leq f_{\neg}(f_{\neg}(m))$ holds for all $m \in M$, then we call $\mathcal{M}$ a *IEL-model*.

Note that truth condition (v) is the Disjunction Property DP which ensures that the smallest filter $\{f_{\top}\}$ of the underlying Heyting algebra is prime. Recall that DP is implicitly satisfied by all $EL3^-$ -models. Also truth condition (i), $f_{\top} \in BEL$, is an implicit property of each $EL3^-$ -model.

The language of Intuitionistic Epistemic Logic does not contain the symbol $\Box$. Let $Fm_e = \{\varphi \in Fm \mid \Box \text{ does not occur in } \varphi\}$. In the following we shall work with formel set Fm_e instead of Fm .

Definition 5.2. Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ is a IEL^- -model, $\gamma: V \rightarrow M$ is an assignment and $\varphi \in Fm_e$. Satisfaction is defined as follows:

$$(\mathcal{M}, \gamma) \models \varphi :\Leftrightarrow \gamma(\varphi) = f_{\top}$$

We say that a formula φ is valid in logic IEL^- (in logic IEL) if $(\mathcal{M}, \gamma) \models \varphi$, for all IEL^- -models (all IEL -models) $\mathcal{M}$ and for all corresponding assignments $\gamma \in M^V$.

In contrast to our *strong* completeness theorems for the classical logics $EL3^-$, $EL3$, $EL4$, $EL5$, we prove here only *weak* soundness and completeness of IEL^- and IEL w.r.t. the proposed algebraic semantics.

Theorem 5.3 (Soundness and Completeness). *Let $\varphi \in Fm_e$. Then φ is a theorem of IEL^- (of IEL) if and only if φ is valid in IEL^- (in IEL).*

Proof. One easily checks that a IEL^- -model satisfies all axioms of IEL^- . Also rule MP is sound, for if in some model $\gamma(\psi \rightarrow \varphi) = f_{\top}$ and $\gamma(\psi) = f_{\top}$, then $\gamma(\psi) \leq \gamma(\varphi)$ and thus $\gamma(\varphi) = f_{\top}$. By induction on derivations, all theorems of IEL^- are valid. By definition, an IEL -model satisfies additionally all formulas of the form $K\varphi \rightarrow \neg\neg\varphi$. Thus, IEL is sound w.r.t. the class of all IEL -models. In order to prove completeness, we consider the Lindenbaum-Tarski algebra of logic IEL^- . Recall that such an algebra is given by the equivalence classes of

formulas modulo the relation $\approx$ defined by $\varphi \approx \psi \Leftrightarrow \varphi \leftrightarrow \psi$ is a theorem, along with the canonical operations on the equivalence classes. In the case of our epistemic language, this yields the following operations (where $\overline{\varphi}$ denotes the equivalence class of formula φ modulo $\approx$): $f_K(\overline{\varphi}) := \overline{K\varphi}$ and $f_*(\overline{\varphi}, \overline{\psi}) := \overline{\varphi * \psi}$, for $*$ $\in \{\vee, \wedge, \rightarrow\}$. It remains to check that $\approx$ is a congruence relation, i.e. $\varphi_1 \approx \psi_1, \varphi_2 \approx \psi_2$ implies $K\varphi_1 \approx K\psi_1$ and $\varphi_1 * \varphi_2 \approx \psi_1 * \psi_2$, for $*$ $\in \{\vee, \wedge, \rightarrow\}$. Suppose $\varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \psi_1$ is a theorem of IEL^- . Then, by co-reflection, $K(\varphi_1 \rightarrow \psi_1)$ and $K(\psi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_1)$ are theorems, too. The distribution axiom yields $K\varphi_1 \leftrightarrow K\psi_1$. The remaining cases follow from properties of IPC. It follows that $\approx$ is a congruence relation. If $\varphi \leftrightarrow \psi$ is (the substitution-instance of) a theorem of IPC, then $\overline{\varphi} = \overline{\psi}$. Thus, the resulting algebra $\mathcal{M}$ satisfies the set of equations that axiomatizes the class of Heyting algebras and is therefore itself a Heyting algebra. Its top element is the congruence class $f_\top := \overline{\top}$, i.e. the class of all IEL^- -theorems. In [[1], Theorem 12] it is shown that both IEL^- and IEL have the disjunction property, which means that the smallest theory, respectively, is prime. Then the Heyting algebra $\mathcal{M}$ has the Disjunction Property DP: $f_\vee(\overline{\varphi}, \overline{\psi}) = f_\top$ implies $\overline{\varphi} = f_\top$ or $\overline{\psi} = f_\top$. If we put $BEL = \{\overline{\varphi} \mid K\varphi \text{ is a theorem of } IEL^-\}$, then one easily verifies that $\mathcal{M} = (\{\overline{\varphi} \mid \varphi \in Fm_e\}, BEL, f_\perp, f_\top, f_\vee, f_\wedge, f_\rightarrow, f_K)$ satisfies all conditions of a IEL^- -model established in Definition 5.1. Consider the assignment ε defined by $x \mapsto \overline{x}$. By induction on the complexity of formulas one shows that $\varepsilon(\varphi) = \overline{\varphi}$, for any $\varphi \in Fm_e$. Thus, $(\mathcal{M}, \varepsilon) \models \varphi \Leftrightarrow \varepsilon(\varphi) = \overline{\varphi} = f_\top \Leftrightarrow \vdash_{IEL^-} \varphi$, for any $\varphi \in Fm_e$. So if φ is not a theorem of IEL^- , then φ is not satisfied by interpretation $(\mathcal{M}, \varepsilon)$ and cannot be valid. We have shown completeness of IEL^- w.r.t. the class of all IEL^- -models. Completeness of IEL w.r.t. the class of all IEL -models follows similarly. $\square$

References

- [1] S. Artemov and T. Protopopescu, *Intuitionistic Epistemic Logic*, The Review of Symbolic Logic 9(2), 266–298, 2016.
- [2] S. L. Bloom and R. Suszko, *Investigation into the sentential calculus with identity*, Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic 13(3), 289 – 308, 1972.
- [3] D. v. Dalen, *Logic and Structure*, Springer, 1997.
- [4] G. E. Hughes and M. J. Cresswell, *A new introduction to modal logic*, Routledge, 1996.

- [5] S. Lewitzka, $\in_K$: *A non-Fregean logic of explicit knowledge*, *Studia Logica* 97(2), 233–264, 2011.
- [6] S. Lewitzka, *Algebraic semantics for a modal logic close to S1*, *Journal of Logic and Computation* 26(5): 1769–1783, 2016, first published online 2014.
- [7] S. Lewitzka, *Denotational semantics for modal systems S3–S5 extended by axioms for Propositional quantifiers and identity*, *Studia Logica* 103(3), 507–544, 2015.
- [8] S. Lewitzka, *A modal logic amalgam of classical and intuitionistic propositional logic*, *Journal of Logic and Computation* (2015), doi: 10.1093/log-com/exv048, First published online: July 20, 2015
- [9] R. Suszko, *Identity Connective and Modality*, *Studia Logica* 27, 7–39, 1971.
- [10] R. Suszko, *Abolition of the fregean axiom*, *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, 453:169–239 (1975), in: R. Parikh (ed.), *Logic Colloquium*, Springer Verlag, 2006.